

Remarks/Argument

Claim Summary

Claims 1-37 remain pending in the application.

Claims 12-20, 22 and 24-37 have been withdrawn from consideration.

However, since dependent claims 12-13 and 15-17 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, it is understood that these dependent claims would be allowed upon the eventual allowance of claim 1.

Claims 1-11, 21 and 23 are currently subject to examination, and stand rejected as follows:

<i>Claim(s)</i>	<i>Rejection</i>	<i>Reference(s)</i>
1, 3, 6-7 and 9-11	102	Campbell et al. (US 4990229)
1, 3, 7-8 and 10	102	Maeda et al. (EP 0676793 A2)
1, 2 and 10	102	Boswell (US 4810935)
2 and 8	103	Campbell et al. in view of Yokota (JP 7-153594)
4-5	103	Campbell et al. in view of Takagi (US 5681393) or Ishii et al. (US 5529657)
21 and 23	103	Campbell et al. in view of Wicker et al. (US 5863376)
2	103	Maeda et al. in view of Yokota
4-5	103	Maeda et al. in view of Takagi or Ishii et al.
6, 9 and 11	103	Maeda et al. in view of Campbell et al.
21 and 23	103	Maeda et al. in view of Wicker et al.
3 and 8	103	Boswell in view of Yokota

4-5	103	Boswell in view of Takagi
6-7, 9 and 11	103	Boswell in view of Campbell et al.
21 and 23	103	Boswell in view of Wicker et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse each of the rejections identified in the table presented above.

Claims 1-3 and 6-11 were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Campbell et al. (US 4990229), and/or Maeda et al. (EP 0676793), and/or Boswell (US 4810935), for the reasons stated at pages 3-5 of the Office Action. In each of these rejections, the Examiner states:

“It should be noted that attenuation of the ions which diffuse into the second chamber and approach the workpiece, by directing a proportion of the ions to a loss surface of either chamber will be produced.”

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s characterization of the Campbell et al, Maeda et al., and Boswell references.

Attention is directed to the DECLARATION OF DR. LESLIE LEA UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.132 (“the Lea Declaration”) already of record.

As described at paragraph 4 of the Lea Declaration, each of Campbell et al., Maeda et al., and Boswell describe helicon type plasma sources which aim to increase the efficiency of energy transfer from the RF power supply to the plasma, i.e., to increase plasma (ion and electron) density.

Helicon type plasma sources such as those of the cited references achieve a result which is opposite to that attributed by the Examiner, and for at least this reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. ¶102.

Several of the dependent claims were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. ¶103 as being unpatentable over Campbell et al. or Maeda et al. or Boswell, in combination with various secondary references cited by the Examiner at pages 6-14 of the Office Action. However, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the same reasons as stated above in connection the rejections under 35 U.S.C. ¶102.

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon the present claims are requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Valentine & Whitt, PLLC
/Adam C. Valentine/

By: Adam C. Valentine
Reg. No. 33,289

April 1, 2010

Customer No. 20987
VOLENTINE & WHITT, PLLC
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260
Reston, VA 20190
571.283.0720